

### III. REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-20, 22 and 23 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 9, and 16 have been amended. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the objections and rejections and reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims, or claims that are potentially broader in scope, in the current and/or a related patent application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for his time and courtesy in conducting a telephone interview with Applicants' undersigned representative on 16 March 2011. During the interview, various aspects of the rejections of claims 1, 9, and 16 as allegedly being unpatentable over Burton, Klatt, and Alvin, and optionally Joseph and McFeely were discussed. No exhibits were demonstrated during the interview, however the amendments presented above were discussed as suggested by Examiner Zimmerman. Applicants' representative agreed that the proposed amendments would overcome the Klatt reference, but that a further search would be required by the Office. The substance of the interview is included in the following remarks.

In the Office Action, the Office rejects claims 1-4, 7-8, 16-19 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burton (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 20020055878), hereafter "Burton," in view of Klatt (U.S. Patent No. 6,415,277), hereafter "Klatt," in further view of Alvin (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,731), hereafter, "Alvin." Applicants submit that the Office fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The Office rejects claims 5, 9-10, 12-15, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly

being unpatentable over Burton and Klatt in further view of Joseph and Alvin.

Independent claims 1 and 16 are secondly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burton and Klatt in further view of Alvin and in further view of McFeely (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 20020184237), hereafter “McFeely.” Independent claim 9 is secondly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burton and Klatt in further view of Joseph (U.S. 6,606, 603), hereafter “Joseph,” in further view of Alvin and in further view of McFeely.

With regard to the 35 USC 103(a) rejections, Applicants assert that the cited combinations fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention as currently amended. For example, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants submit that the cited references, either Burton in view of Klatt and Alvin, or secondly further in view of McFeely, fail to teach or suggest the feature of “a system for detecting an error with a system-initiated item request based on a lack of locating a supplier or an approver.” For instance, as discussed in the interview with Examiner Zimmerman, Klatt fails to teach or suggest such a feature. Applicants agree that no such disclosure exists in Klatt, and that the Burton and McFeely references fail to remedy this deficiency.

Accordingly, the proposed combination of Klatt, Burton, Alvin, and/or McFeely fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants’ independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 103(a) rejection of claim 1, and claims 2-4 and 7-8, which depend therefrom.

With regard to the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 9, Applicants assert that the cited combinations fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For

example, Applicants submit that, for at least the reasons given above, the cited references, with or without the additional Joseph reference, fail to teach or suggest the feature of “detecting an error in the system-initiated request based on a lack of locating a supplier or an approver.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection of claim 9, and claims 10 and 12-15 which depend therefrom.

With regard to the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 16, Applicants assert that the cited combination fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, Applicants submit that, for at least the reasons given above, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the feature of “program code for detecting an error in the system-initiated request based on a lack of locating a supplier or an approver.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection of claim 16, and claims 17-20 and 22-23 which depend therefrom.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all dependent claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office’s interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office’s combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such

combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nathan B. Davis/

Date: March 21, 2011

---

Nathan B. Davis  
Reg. No.: 67,474

Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)